



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for the further use of the current fashion of unusual metrical schemes. As Zimmermann suggests, the *Carmen Diophantis* also employs the "cholana-paests" in introducing a sufferer with the gout.

One phase, as it may seem, Zimmerman develops insufficiently. While he does emphasize the mocking satire upon the orthodox gods in the claims put forth by *Podagra*, and in one sentence briefly remarks: "Nec sane *Podagra* fabula tam facete composita Luciani ingenio indigna est," yet he might well have supplemented the more obvious suggestions of vocabulary and meter by a fuller discussion of the delicate criteria of Lucian's humor which may, perhaps, be detected in the *Tragopodagra*.

Although the argument that Lucian would not have repeated this same theme in a second piece seems hardly cogent in view of the many instances to the contrary in the Lucianic canon, the inferior character of the *Ocypus* itself is made out well enough.

Zimmermann, finally, tries to prove that the *Ocypus* was written in the year 364 A.D. by Acacius the friend of Libanius. This is based on a reference in one of Libanius' letters to a "witty" piece on this theme which Acacius had sent him. Since Acacius and Libanius were both at this time victims of the disease, it would perhaps be only charitable to think of them as already sufficiently punished without attributing to the one the authorship or to the other the commendation of this jejune piece.

If the *Ocypus* was really written by Lucian, and not by Acacius or some other unknown author, we must assume that the gout had by this time attacked him in both feet. In the *Tragopodagra* he limps, indeed, but can still bustle about like Hephaestus with his cup of humor not wholly emptied.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

Die Dioskuren als Retter zur See bei den Griechen und Römern, und ihr Fortleben in christlichen Legenden. VON KARL JAISLE. Dissertation. Tübingen, 1907.

This dissertation is divided into two parts: a good collection chronologically arranged of the references in Greek and Latin literature and inscriptions to the Dioscuri as protectors on the sea, and a discussion of the supposed survival of these gods in Christian saints. The former has considerable value as a collection of material; the latter is of little worth.

In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as every reader of Homer knows, Castor is only a master-driver and Polydeuces a master-boxer. But in the Homeric hymn 33, which probably belongs to the sixth century B.C., the brothers appear (vss. 6 ff.) with their later function fully developed: they are σωτήρες . . . ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων ὀκυπόρων τε νεῶν. Thenceforth they have this office clearly defined in Greek literature and in Latin poetry influenced by the Greek, without losing their general character as horsemen who assist men in time of battle or of other need. This specialization of function can

hardly be explained in the simple way suggested by Jaisle (p. 4). It is quite possible that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in this matter, as elsewhere, show us only one phase of current thought, and that the belief in the Dioscuri as general protectors and helpers may have developed at a period anterior to the Homeric epics, although it was hardly inherited from the "Indo-european period." On this point Jaisle should have consulted not Myrianthus, but Charles Reuel, *L'évolution d'un mythe, Aëvins et Dioscures*, Paris, 1896—a book from which he could have learned much. Nor should he have neglected Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, 50, 207–15.

The paucity of dedications to the Dioscuri in their special office is striking. Jaisle gives three Greek inscriptions (*IG*, IV, 1279; VII, 1826; XIV, 2461), all of the Roman period; the two Latin (*CIL*, VI, 413; XIII, 3026) are not certainly to the point.

So far as the second part of this dissertation is concerned it had better not have been written. There is no proof that the martyrs Castor and Pollux, or the saints Castor of Coblenz, Polyuctus of Melitene, and Phocas of Sinope (who is related to Priapus!) have anything to do with the Castor and Pollux of pagan legend and belief. On the other hand, Peter and Paul in Naples inherited certain functions of the Dioscuri with their temple—Peter opening, Paul closing the floodgates of heaven.

The long delay in noticing this dissertation has been due in large measure to an oversight on the part of the reviewer, for which he would express his regret.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

Xenophontis Scripta minora. Fasciculus posterior opuscula politica equestria venatica continens post Ludovicum Dindorf edidit FRANCISCUS RUEHL. Accedunt Simonis De re equestri quae supersunt. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Of the six essays of Xenophon contained in this volume we now have three at least, the *Hipparchus*, the *Cynegeticus*, and the *De re equestri*, in a much less corrupt form than when the first Teubner edition appeared. This is due to the rediscovery by Ruehl of the Codex Vaticanus Graecus 989 (V), which contains all three and is far superior to those previously used, and to the finding of Codex Vindobonensis iv, 34 (W), containing the *Cynegeticus* and the *De re equestri*, an authority reckoned superior even to V. On the basis of these two codices, together with the inferior class, a group of Italian scholars, Cerocchi, Tommasini, and Pierleoni, have published in the Weidmann press separate editions of the *Hipparchus* (1901), the *De re equestri* (1902), and the *Cynegeticus* (1902), which have received the unanimous praise of the reviewers. Pierleoni has also given us an excellent edition of the *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* (1906). The *De vectigalibus*, then, is the only one of the six which has not recently been given the dignity of a separate